DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 750 UD 025 363

AUTHOR Quinones, Nathan
TITLE Dropout Prevention Programs, 1985-1986. Progress Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 43p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attendance; Dropout Characteristics; *Dropout Prevention; *Dropout Programs; Dropout Rate; Nontraditional Education; *Potential Dropouts; *Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; Secondary Education; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This report provides an overview of the operation of two innovative New York City dropout prevention programs, the Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention Program (AIDP) and the Dropout Prevention Program (DPP). First, basic program components, required and site-specific, are described briefly. Each program site must provide these components: a site facilitator, an attendance outreach program, guidance and counseling services, a health services program, a school-level linkage program, and an alternative education program. Next, the status of program implementation through January 1986 is discussed. Statistics on 1985 attendance rates are compared to Fall 1984 rates. Characteristics of the targeted students are summarized, and month-by-month attendance for all participating schools is presented and analyzed in order to provide a preliminary picture of the programs' effects. General findings are that all components of both programs were fully implemented and operational by the end of 1985. Preliminary effects were an 0.8 percent increase in fall attendance at participating high schools, a decline of nearly 20 percent in the number of long-term absentees at participating high schools, an increased attendance at most AIDP middle schools, and an increase of 8.2 percent at special education AIDP sites. The report also includes detailed descriptions of several exemplary programs and an appendix presenting supplementary statistical information. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2/17/87

ED279750

New York City
Board of Education

DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAMS 1985-1986

PROGRESS REPORT

Nathan Quinones
Chancellor

UD 025363

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T.K. Minter
NYC Board of Ed.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Message from the Chancellor	1
Introduction	4
Program Design	5
Program Implementation	9
Outcome Measures	12
Characteristics of Students in the AIDP and DPP Programs	16
Descriptions of Exemplary Programs	19

Appendix

AIDP and DPP High Schools (Attachment 1)

AIDP and DPP Middle Schools (Attachment 2)

Community-Based Organizations Providing Services to AIDP and DPP (Attachment 3)

Dropout Prevention Programs in the Middle Schools: Implementation as of January 31, 1986 (Attachment 4)

Attendance of AIDP Participants as Reported to State Education Department by Community School Districts (Attachment 5)

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 LIVINGSTON STREET
BROOKLYN, N.Y. 11201

NATHAN QUINONES
CHANCELLOR

PROGRESS REPORT
1985-86 DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Message from the Chancellor

This progress report on the Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention Program (AIDP) and the Dropout Prevention Program (DPP) includes information on program services and participating students through January, 1986. It also highlights the positive effects of these programs on student attendance in the fall term.

Dropout prevention is my highest priority as Chancellor. Despite the fact that too many of our students leave school as dropouts (35.3% in 1984-85), we are making progress in dropout prevention. The 1984-85 dropout rate was 6.6% lower than in the previous year. Many of our current initiatives, including class size reduction, high school redesign, and the expansion of bilingual services, can be expected to improve student retention. A key component of our dropout prevention strategy is to intervene when students' poor attendance indicates that they are in danger of dropping out of school. The programs reported on here represent a major effort to bring frequently absent students back into school in a way which welcomes them and supports their learning.

The AIDP program, which is State-funded, and the DPP program, which is City-funded, operate in both middle schools and high schools. Each school participating in these programs is required to provide six components: 1) a site facilitator and pupil

personnel committee; 2) attendance outreach; 3) guidance and counseling services; 4) health services; 5) transitional services to help students move from middle to high school; and 6) an alternative educational program.

By January 1986, the following information had been gathered about program implementation:

- In the 26 AIDP high schools, all components were fully implemented by the end of the fall term. The academic and guidancecomponents were largely in place at the beginning of the term. 3,866 students were served.

- In the 10 DPP high schools, dropout prevention strategies were integrated into the day-to-day life of the schools. 8,540 students were served or affected in these schools.

- All program components were operational in the 97 AIDP and DPP middle schools. 13,286 students were targeted for service.

- The AIDP-funded special education program was implemented at 36 middle school sites, targeting 1,674 students. Ten additional sites were targeted for the spring.

- A total of 27,366 students were receiving direct services or program enhancements; of these, 8,052 students had received services from community-based organizations as of April 1986.

The AIDP and DPP programs are designed to serve students at risk of dropping out of school. Preliminary data, presented in more detail later in this report, indicate that the programs are serving the students for whom the funds were intended. The high schools, in particular, appear to be serving a population on the verge of dropping out--old enough to be legally discharged and having failed most of their courses the previous year.

Highlights of the effects of the 1985-86 AIDP and DPP programs through January, 1986, include:

- an increase of 0.8% in fall attendance at participating high schools as compared with the previous fall--an increase far greater than the 0.1% increase for other high schools in the system;

- for participating middle schools, a drop in attendance in September and October, followed by increased attendance beginning in November, when most services were fully implemented;

- a decline of nearly 20% in the number of long-term absentees on register in AIDP and DPP high schools as compared with the previous fall;

- increased attendance of targeted students in 49 out of 61 AIDP middle schools, as self-reported by school districts; and

- an increase of 8.2% in attendance at special education AIDP sites from June to December, 1985.

A final report, which will be issued in October, 1986, will present more information about the services implemented, the students served, and the effects of the programs during the 1985-86 school year. If the trends reported here continue for the rest of the year, I expect that we will see encouraging results in that final report.

NATHAN QUINONES
Chancellor

INTRODUCTION

Two innovative dropout prevention programs--the Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention Program (AIDP) and the Dropout Prevention Program (DPP)--have received major resources and attention within the New York City public school system in the 1985-86 school year. Additional State and City funding has been combined with existing budgets and personnel in programs designed to encourage students to stay in school. These programs have been supported, also, by careful monitoring and evaluation, new data collection techniques, extensive technical assistance, and expanded partnerships with outside service agencies.

The State-funded Attendance Improvement and Dropout Prevention Program (AIDP) serves students in 26 high schools and 68 intermediate or junior high schools. The City-funded Dropout Prevention Program (DPP) serves students in 10 high schools and 29 intermediate or junior high schools; the DPP schools also receive some State funding. AIDP and DPP programs for special education students operate at a total of 46 middle school sites and within all AIDP and DPP high school sites.

This report will provide an overview of the actual operation of the AIDP and DPP programs through January, 1986. As background, the basic principles of program design and the mandated program components will be described briefly. The status of program implementation through January, 1986, will also be presented. Characteristics of the targeted students will be summarized, based upon October 31, 1985 rosters. Finally, the month-by-month attendance, through January, 1986, for all participating schools will be presented and analyzed in order to provide a preliminary picture of the programs' effects.

PROGRAM DESIGN

a. Guiding Principles

The AIDP and DPP programs have been designed on the basis of a specific set of principles about how to combat the dropout problem.

First, the process of dropping out begins for many students long before the decision to leave school. Unexcused absence is a symptom of trouble, so that efforts should be focused on students with attendance problems. The AIDP and DPP programs both use absence as the primary criterion in selecting students for participation.

Second, attendance rates decline after elementary school, so that a significant share of dropout prevention efforts should take place in intermediate and junior high schools. Both programs give highest priority to the last two years of middle school and the first two years of high school for the delivery of services.

Third, students drop out of school for many different reasons, so that dropout prevention efforts should make available a comprehensive range of services to which students can be individually referred. All schools participating in the AIDP and DPP programs must have available six specific program components, described below.

Fourth, the school system should bring other agencies and organizations into the effort to meet the needs of young people. A total of 17 community-based organizations provide services under contract to the Board of Education as part of these programs. The Department of Health and other city agencies also play an important role: in screening students for vision and hearing defects and health problems, for example. In addition, program personnel refer students to services already available in their communities.

Last, the resources made available by the State and City should be focused on a relatively limited number of sites and students in order to have a substantial impact on the lives of children. For this reason, efforts are concentrated into approximately half the middle schools and one third of the high schools in the system; within each school, services are targeted on specific students who meet the eligibility criteria.

b. Program Design--Mandated Components

Each AIDP and DPP site is required to provide six program components. These components--some of which may be funded through sources other than AIDP and DPP--are as follows:

(1) A teacher serving as a site facilitator, who is freed from home room assignment and two other periods per day. The facilitator identifies and tracks the progress of targeted students, coordinates all program activities, and facilitates the activities of a pupil personnel committee, which recommends and follows up on a comprehensive framework of services for each eligible student.

(2) A program of attendance outreach, to follow up on the absence of targeted students through parental awareness. This program operates in addition to mandated daily attendance activities, and may include incentives to encourage targeted students to attend regularly.

(3) Appropriate guidance and counseling services available to every targeted student, in order to identify and address individual problems that may contribute to poor attendance.

(4) A health services program, consisting of diagnostic screening of students in physical, psychological, and educational areas, referral for appropriate follow-up services, and assurance that needed services are provided.

(5) A school-level linkage program to address the problems of students who make the transition from one level of schooling to the next. This includes the development of relationships between the staffs and students at middle schools and high schools.

(6) A high-interest alternative education program which incorporates basic skills instruction and individualized attention in order to encourage better attendance and improve achievement.

Schools are encouraged to contract with community-based organizations (CBOs) for some of the components of their program.

c. Specific Features of Program Models

The high school AIDP programs are targeted on grades 9 and 10. They use three different service models: SOAR (Student Opportunity, Advancement, and Retention), an instructional and guidance program, is implemented in 16 schools; seven schools have individually-developed strategies for delivering the six components; and three schools are implementing Operation Success, a work readiness and experience program provided by a CBO. The middle school AIDP programs are targeted on the two final grades in each school, either grades 7 and 8 or grades 8 and 9. Schools must provide the six mandated components in the basic program design; the alternative education component is generally career education, after-school enrichment, or both.

The high school DPP program uses the 10 program schools as "laboratory" settings in which new approaches to dropout prevention are developed and tested. Six of these schools are pursuing "systemic" activities aimed at changing the basic educational environment. The other four schools are making use of Operation Success within the laboratory framework. All DPP high schools are working with CBOs to some extent. The middle school DPP program is similar to the middle school AIDP program, with one exception: in half of the DPP schools (14 of 29), all program components other than the facilitator and pupil personnel committee are being provided by community-based organizations.

Special education students are receiving services in two ways. In the high schools, special education students are included in the AIDP and DPP programs along with general education students. In the middle schools, the Division of Special Education is providing services at 46 sites. The DSE program focuses on emotionally handicapped students and provides the six components directly through program staff and indirectly through staff development activities with teachers at each site.

Community-based organizations are participating in the Board's dropout prevention efforts. Of the ten districts in the middle school DPP programs, five are using CBOs to provide most services, while five are relying exclusively on school system personnel. In the high schools, Operation Success is extensively implemented at seven schools and 13 other CBOs are providing services to AIDP and DPP schools. Some CBOs provide comprehensive services which include several or all of the mandated program components; others provide limited special services. The evaluation of these innovative activities is an important feature. AIDP is being evaluated by the Office of Educational Assessment. An outside evaluation of DPP will be performed by Teachers College; this evaluation will compare the relative effectiveness of different program models.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The AIDP and DPP programs have introduced a number of new program models and services into the schools. Among the innovations are:

- the requirement that schools provide a comprehensive service package;
- for DPP, the "laboratory" framework, in which innovation continues throughout the year as new needs are identified and new approaches are developed;
- for AIDP, the careful specification of program characteristics set out in Chancellor's Memorandum No. 29, 1984-1985, June 7, 1985;
- the teacher-facilitator in AIDP schools and DPP middle schools; the corresponding and more extensive responsibilities of the teacher serving as dropout coordinator in DPP high schools;
- the extensive use of community-based organizations for the provision of such services as counseling and attendance outreach, including CBOs with no prior experience in contracting with the Board;
- the pupil personnel committee; and
- the school linkage activities.

In order to ensure that programs were implemented as well and as quickly as possible, extensive technical assistance has been provided by the Office of High School Support Services, the Dropout Prevention Program staff, and the Office of Student Progress. In addition, all program schools were monitored during

October to establish the level of implementation, the need for technical assistance, and the possible existence of widespread difficulties with particular features of program implementation.

Among the implementation issues and requirements which have been addressed are:

- the systemwide shortage of middle school guidance counselors, which led to the development of alternative ways of providing guidance services;

- the need for technical assistance: in the use of automated attendance equipment in the high schools; in the design of career education programs in the middle schools; and in the use of a life skills training approach in special education;

- the lack in some middle schools of sufficient numbers of students eligible under the original guidelines, which led to the establishment of new eligibility criteria;

- a midyear expansion of the special education program.

The community-based organizations have presented a special set of implementation problems, including the complexity of the contracting process and the difficulty of integrating CBO operations with the priorities and the day-to-day realities of the schools which they serve. As of April, CBOs provided services to 6,167 high school students and to 1,885 middle school students, a total of 8,052.

The academic and guidance components of the high school AIDP programs were largely in place at the beginning of the fall term. Implementation concerns included: establishing the eligibility of program participants; developing pupil personnel committees; filling vacancies among health resource coordinators (HRCs), who are Department of Health employees; and establishing CBO programs in six schools. By the end of the fall term, all program elements

were in place except for one HRC vacancy. 3,866 students were served during the fall term at the 26 AIDP high schools.

The high school DPP programs continue to develop new kinds of services and to integrate dropout prevention strategies into the day-to-day life of the school. Implementation concerns included: building school-wide support for dropout prevention through school-based planning; fully implementing CBO services; creating links to outside organizations to provide resources and job training opportunities; and overcoming administrative obstacles such as space shortages and the difficulty of adjusting the schedules of personnel. It is estimated that 8,540 students were directly served or affected substantially by DPP activities in the fall term.

As of midyear, the middle school AIDP and DPP programs were operational in all 97 sites, with 13,286 students targeted for service. Individual components or services were still lacking in some sites (see appendix), but with one exception (linkage) all components were in place in nearly all sites. The five middle school CBOs, which serve a total of 14 DPP schools, all began work in the fall term.

As of midyear, the AIDP-funded special education program was implemented in 36 sites, targeting 1,674 students. In each special education region, a full program of service was in place. A major thrust of this program is outreach: as of February 1, 1986, 973 home visits, 1,402 telephone contacts, and 450 mail contacts were reported. The other program components are provided to targeted students as appropriate.

To ensure that special education students received their fair share of DPP funding, the program was expanded in the spring term to an additional ten sites.

OUTCOME MEASURES

a. Fall Term Attendance in AIDP and DPP Schools

The AIDP and DPP programs appear to be having a significant positive impact on student attendance in participating schools. At this time, our data refer to the attendance of all students, not just students receiving services. For the fall term, attendance in AIDP and DPP high schools was up by 0.8%. This is equivalent to an average improvement of about 0.7 day per student for a term, or between one and two days a year. In the middle schools, attendance started to rise in November, the point at which most programs were substantially implemented. Two comparisons have been made: (1) comparing attendance rates for participating schools in the fall of 1985 with those in the fall of 1984; and (2) comparing the change in attendance rates between Fall 1984 and Fall 1985 for participating schools with that for other schools in the system. In both cases, positive trends can be seen for participating schools.

As shown in Table I, the high school findings are very positive. Fall term attendance rose substantially in AIDP and DPP high schools, from 74.7% in Fall 1984 to 75.5% in Fall 1985. In every month except October, when attendance fell by 0.3%, attendance for students in the AIDP and DPP high schools exceeded attendance for the previous year: by 1.3% in September; 0.4% in November; 1.2% in December; and 2.2% in January.

The Fall 1985 attendance rate in the AIDP and DPP middle schools was 83.7%, the same as in Fall 1984. Month by month, however, a positive trend emerges. In September and October, attendance rates in these schools were lower than the previous year, by 1.2% in September and by 0.7% in October. Beginning in November, AIDP and DPP middle schools began to outperform their previous year's attendance: by 0.4% in November; 1.3% in December; and 0.6% in January. If this trend is maintained, it will demonstrate that these programs, which focus on the students most at risk, have a significant school-wide effect.

TABLE I

SCHOOLS PARTICIPATING IN AIDP OR DPP:
FALL 1985 ATTENDANCE RATES COMPARED TO FALL 1984 ATTENDANCE RATES

HIGH SCHOOLS

	1984-85	1985-86	Difference
September	74.6	75.9	+1.3
October	75.9	75.6	-0.3
November	75.7	76.1	+0.4
December	74.4	75.6	+1.2
January	72.0	74.2	+2.2
Fall term	74.7	75.5	+0.8

MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	1984-85	1985-86	Difference
September	85.2	84.0	-1.2
October	84.9	84.2	-0.7
November	84.0	84.4	+0.4
December	82.8	84.1	+1.3
January	81.6	82.2	+0.6
Fall term	83.7	83.7	0.0

Table II further illustrates the significance of these increases in attendance rates from Fall 1984 to Fall 1985 by comparing program schools to other schools. The participating high schools, showed substantially more improvement in attendance than did non-participating schools in four out of five months: in September by 1.5%; in November by 0.1%; in December by 0.8%; and in January by 1.7%. For the semester, high schools receiving dropout prevention services improved their attendance by 0.8%, while in other high schools attendance rose by 0.1%. When compared with middle schools not part of AIDP or DPP, the participating middle schools show more increase in November (by 0.2%); December (by 0.3%); and January (by 0.5%).

TABLE II

CHANGE IN ATTENDANCE RATES BETWEEN 1984-85 AND 1985-86

HIGH SCHOOLS

	AIDP/DPP Schools	Other Schools (academic & vocational)
September	+1.3	-0.2
October	-0.3	0
November	+0.4	+0.3
December	+1.2	+0.4
January	+2.2	+0.5
Fall term	+0.8	+0.1

MIDDLE SCHOOLS

	AIDP/DPP Schools	Other Schools
September	-1.2	-0.4
October	-0.7	+0.1
November	+0.4	+0.2
December	+1.3	+1.0
January	+0.6	+0.1
Fall term	0.0	+0.2

b. Long Term Absentees

Another encouraging statistic is that smaller numbers of students on register in AIDP and DPP high schools were classified as long-term absentees. In January, 1985, there were 7,369 LTAs in these 36 high schools. In January, 1986, 6,031 students in AIDP and DPP schools were absent every day of the month and were therefore reported as LTAs. The decline of 1,338 in the number of LTAs in these schools--a decline of nearly one-fifth--must be regarded as a positive outcome, even though the number of LTAs is still much too high: 6.3% of the gross register.

c. Attendance for Targeted Students in Middle Schools

Official data on the impact of the AIDP and DPP programs on attendance of program students will be produced as part of the program evaluations. For the middle school and special education programs, there are some preliminary data which appear encouraging, based on midyear reports to the State Education Department for the AIDP program. Reports submitted by community school districts indicate that attendance of targeted students improved over the previous year in 49 of 61 AIDP schools. Districts also submitted data for sixteen of the 29 DPP middle schools; twelve of the sixteen schools reported that attendance improved among targeted students.

d. Special Education

The Division of Special Education reported at midyear that the average attendance of special education students in AIDP program sites was 70.5% in December 1985, up from 62.3% in June 1985. As their program is designed to improve the basic functioning of special education classrooms, these results--which include targeted and other students--are encouraging.

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS IN THE AIDP AND DPP PROGRAMS

The AIDP and DPP programs are designed to serve students who are at risk of dropping out of school. Students were selected for these programs primarily on the basis of attendance. Secondary criteria used for selection included reading scores, course failures, limited proficiency in English, age in relation to grade placement, and reading scores (for high school students).

Preliminary data show that the programs are in fact serving those students for whom the funds were intended.

As Table III demonstrates, the high school programs serve students in great academic difficulty. Over half the participants failed more than 8 courses in 1984-85. Large numbers of program participants were also absent more than 60 days in 1984-85 (one third of the school year): 33% of targeted students in the DPP schools, 43% in the AIDP schools using school-based programs, and 59% in the three AIDP schools using the Operation Success model. More than half the program participants are at least two years overage for their grade, which indicates that even if they made normal progress beginning this year, they would not graduate until age 20 at the earliest.

In the middle school programs, as shown in Table IV, attendance and academic problems are severe, but not as extreme as among high school students. About 30% of program participants were absent more than 45 days in the 1984-85 school year. Middle school students were much less likely to have failed most of their courses: fewer than one-fifth failed four or more in June 1985. About a third of participants were two or more years older than standard for their grade level.

TABLE III

CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN AIDP AND DPP

NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT DURING THE PREVIOUS SCHOOL YEAR (September through May)

	Less than 30	31-45	46-60	61-75	over 75
AIDP/SOAR and "strategies"	5%	23%	28%	16%	27%
AIDP/Op. Success	8%	18%	18%	16%	43%
DPP	29%	21%	17%	11%	22%

COURSES FAILED 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR (January and June)

	0-4	5-7	8 or more
AIDP/SOAR and "strategies"	13%	24%	63%
AIDP/Op. Success	12%	21%	67%
DPP	21%	22%	57%

AGE IN RELATION TO GRADE

	Two or more years over age for grade
AIDP	55%
DPP	56%

READING SCORES

	Two or more years below grade level
AIDP	48%
DPP	66%

NOTE:
Data are based on preliminary rosters of students targeted in the fall term. These rosters include information on 9,918 students. Data from two DPP schools are not included. Percentages in the tables are based on students for whom valid data are available at this time: days absent, 6,769 students; course failures, 6,904 students; age in relation to grade, 6,874 students; reading scores, 5,643 students. DPP schools using the "systemic" model are providing services to students in addition to those reported here; these data refer to students counted as "targeted" for evaluation purposes. Data on courses failed refer to semester courses; courses taken in middle school are treated as two-semester courses ending in June.

TABLE IV

CHARACTERISTICS OF MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS IN AIDP AND DPP

NUMBER OF DAYS ABSENT DURING THE PREVIOUS SCHOOL YEAR (September through May)

	Less than 30	31-45	46-60	61-75	over 75
AIDP	40%	33%	14%	7%	6%
DPP	37%	36%	15%	8%	4%

COURSES FAILED: JUNE 1985

	0-1	2-3	4 or more
AIDP	55%	25%	20%
DPP	59%	27%	14%

AGE IN RELATION TO GRADE

	Two or more years over age for grade
AIDP	24%
DPP	28%

NOTE:
Data are based on preliminary rosters of students targeted in the fall term. These rosters include information on 14,117 students. Percentages in the tables are based on students for whom valid data are available at this time: days absent, 13,092 students; courses failed, 11,356; age in relation to grade, 11,914 students.

a. Middle School Program

COMPONENT 1 - Facilitating Services

Facilitator - an experienced member of the regular school staff, selected by the principal based upon a history of effective teaching and positive interpersonal relationships with students. Basic responsibility is to coordinate and monitor the delivery of support services to targeted students. Some of the specific responsibilities include the following:

- Maintains documentation of services rendered in attendance outreach, guidance, and health
- Coordinates assignments of AI/DP staff and monitors their documentation
- Acts as the liaison between the principal, AI/DP staff, other school staff and/or CBO staff
- Liaison to the high school for linkage and orientation services
- Makes recommendations for program modifications
- Develop attendance incentive strategies with staff and is responsible for purchasing incentive awards and organizing trips
- Coordinates and monitors extended day activities

Pupil Personnel Committee - a school-based committee which is coordinated by the Facilitator under the supervision of the principal or designated assistant principal. The committee includes staff having direct impact on the AI/DP population. It includes:

- Principal
- Facilitator
- Teacher Mentors
- Extended Day Teachers
- Guidance Personnel
- Health Resource Coordinator
- Attendance Outreach Personnel

Meetings are held twice a month to discuss matters directly affecting AI/DP students. They include:

- Strategies to deal with recurring attendance/guidance/health/academic problems
- Specific student cases
- Roles of staff in the program
- Extended day activities
- High School Linkage
- Appropriate attendance incentives

COMPONENT 2 - Attendance Outreach

The AI/DP Family Assistant checks the attendance of all AI/DP students on a daily basis. Students who arrive late report to the Family Assistant to have their attendance updated. With this information the Family Assistant programs the automated dialer to call parents, notifying them of their child's absence. Personal calls are also made.

The AI/DP Family Assistant makes home visits when students are absent for three consecutive days. At that time, when needed, school conferences are scheduled between parents, student and appropriate school staff.

Home contact is also made with the families of students whose attendance has greatly improved. This is done through telephone calls, home visits and letters of commendation mailed to the home.

- -

Attendance Incentives

A system for rewarding students for improved attendance has been created by recognizing immediate, incremental improvement as well as sustained, long-range change in attendance behavior.

Daily participation in early morning mentoring sessions, improved daily attendance and improved scholarship are recognized monthly at special assembly programs. Prizes are awarded (McDonald's Certificate, ticket to a neighborhood activity and scholarship medals) and points are earned and accumulated that allow students to compete for grand prizes and invitations to the end of year AI/DP banquet.

COMPONENT 3 - Guidance/Counseling Services

The effectiveness of this component is based upon a cohesive working relationship between AI/DP staff (Guidance Counselor & Family Assistant) and non-AI/DP staff (school administrators, District SAPIS Counselor and the Health Resource Coordinator). The Pupil Personnel Committee is used as a means to provide a holistic approach to the delivery of supportive services. Reasonable goals and strategies are planned by the staff to provide students with positive school experiences, allowing the students to feel successful in academic and personal endeavors.

Through individual and group counseling, strong bonds and improved interpersonal relationships develop between students and between students and staff. Improvement in attendance and school work entitles students to participate in a variety of AI/DP rewards and activities. Trips, monthly birthday luncheons, certificates of merit and placement on the "Wall of Fame" all help to maintain daily contact with students giving students a sense of belonging in a positive environment.

- -

Each of four teacher mentors has a group of 15 students that meets daily from 8:00 AM to 8:40 AM. The meeting begins with the mentors and students sharing breakfast. During this time the format becomes a rap session where students can discuss their concerns and ask questions about school-related matters. Homework help is another major activity conducted during these morning sessions. Additionally, each group plans for a weekly incentive activity that takes place after school. Students who attend at least four morning sessions a week qualify to participate in the incentive activity.

Home contact by the teacher mentors is made regularly, to inform parents that their children are not attending the morning activities as well as provide positive reinforcement for those students who are making progress.

COMPONENT 4 - Health Services

The AI/DP Facilitator and the Health Resource Coordinator reached consensus on the following procedures and health services:

- Facilitator provided the Health Resource Coordinator with a list of targeted AI/DP students
- Health Resource Coordinator screened health records of all students, checking for most recent physical examination
- Notations were made on students in need of vision, hearing and dental screening
- Students participating in the gymnastics and weight training programs were required to provide documentation on medical approval to participate in the specialized programs
- Health Resource Coordinator provided students and their families with a choice of three community health providers who would administer medical examinations by accepting medicaid or a sliding-scale fee
- Completed forms were returned to the Facilitator and students in need of follow-up were identified with the Health Resource Coordinator providing additional counseling and/or referrals.

COMPONENT 5 - High School Linkage

The High School Linkage component was initiated with a joint-level meeting between district staff, middle school staff, and high school staff. Hosted by the high school principal, the joint-level meeting gave high school and community school district staff an opportunity to meet, share information on schools and students and schedule a series of cluster meetings which enabled staff to plan appropriate activities that would be informative and meaningful to the middle school students.

Small groups of students (8 to 10) visited the high school for a three hour orientation meeting. During the visit, the middle school students met high school faculty, (Principal, Assistant Principal of Guidance, freshman counselor) and received a general orientation about the school, freshman program, specific course offerings, special programs and high school graduation requirements. Additionally, students were given tours of the building, assigned a high school student mentor and treated to lunch. Many of the middle school students also participated in several after-school programs where they met and worked with their high school counterparts.

COMPONENT 6 - Career Education

Under the supervision of AI/DP staff (teacher mentor and career education teacher), students created four business enterprises. For each enterprise, a student Board of Directors was formed. In an effort to insure that these businesses are self-sustaining, the boards undertake the following responsibilities:

- formulate general policies
- establish working conditions
- set rates of compensation
- set production schedules
- develop a merit system for student employees.

The four enterprises are:

- a general store where cookies, snacks, and school supplies are sold
- an "Auto Magic Clinic" which provides a car wash and wax service
- an AI/DP student Newspaper
- a Performing Arts Company, currently performing the musical comedy "Pippin"

In each enterprise, students earn money and must maintain a savings account in which a portion of their salary must be deposited each month.

- -

Extended School Day

Attendance in the after-school program averages 110 students per day. This atypical success is due largely to the commitment of the AI/DP Facilitator. Throughout the day, both in the school and in the community, the Facilitator is visible and is sensitive to the needs of the students.

Based upon an assessment of student requests and needs, courses are developed together with the after-school faculty in a team approach.

At 3:00 PM all the students assemble in the parents' room where they are treated to snacks and special ethnic food, prepared by AI/DP staff and parent volunteers. This assembly also affords students an opportunity to socialize among peers before starting their after-school classes which consist of:

- Tutorial classes in reading, mathematics and homework help
- Counseling rap sessions with teacher mentors
- Computer classes for enrichment activities
- Career education/enterprise classes

From the beginning, parental involvement was seen as an important part of this program and as such was integrated into this component. Several dinners were organized where the students planned and prepared dinners with teachers and parents to celebrate such occasions as: Puerto Rican Discovery Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas.

b. High School AIDP Program (SOAR)

Project SOAR (Student Opportunity, Advancement, and Retention) is currently operating in 16 of the 26 AIDP high schools. As in the other AIDP models, Project SOAR contains the following six components: program coordination by a site facilitator, attendance outreach, guidance counseling, health services, linkages for middle school students and an alternative instructional program.

In September, an exemplary high school targeted 150 at-risk ninth grade students for Project SOAR. Each student had been absent at least 20 days in the Spring term of 1985 or 40 days during the entire 1984-85 school year. Each student had also failed to pass enough classes to be promoted to the tenth grade. Through the inspired efforts of a dedicated team, improved attendance and academic success have replaced the cycle of excessive absence and subsequent failure for most of these students.

The Pupil Personnel Committee, chaired by the facilitator, is comprised of administrators, teachers, guidance personnel and parents who meet regularly to review and assess the services provided to the students.

The family assistants, under the direction of the guidance counselor and facilitator, have launched an aggressive campaign of attendance outreach. Through numerous home visits and phone calls the team works with parents and students to improve attendance.

The guidance counselor conducts group sessions, individual counseling sessions and parent conferences. Additionally, she has developed a program of Career Education activities and has subsequently been able to place one fifth of these students in the STEP job program.

In addition to vision, hearing and dental screening by an on-site physician's assistant, the students have also been able to obtain physicals for working papers to enable them to secure employment.

The exemplary high school has a comprehensive Linkage component. Linked with eight middle schools, the school has provided eighth grade AIDP students opportunities to attend weekly science and computer workshops, interact with high school mentors and attend articulation sessions to facilitate the transition to high school.

One of the keys to the success of the SOAR Program in general and the program at the school in particular is the caring, personalized mini-school environment. Students are blocked in small classes in English, math, computers, social studies and tutorial. English teachers utilize an intensive Writing Skills Improvement package developed by the Foundations for Learning Program. Teachers meet regularly to discuss students' progress, projects and approaches. Students meet regularly with the guidance counselor to evaluate the program components and their roles in the success of the program. In order to supplement the classroom experiences and encourage and acknowledge improved attendance, the AIDP team has planned a trip to Albany and has taken the students to both Broadway and Off-Broadway performances. Parents attend selected on site performances and follow-up workshops with the students.

A collaboration of administrators, teachers, para-professionals, parents and students have joined to make a positive, substantive difference for the students in the SOAR Program.

c. High School DPP program

The high school in this example, located in an extremely poor, burned-out section of the city, is an example of the combined approach in DPP: both CBO case management and "systemic" school improvement. The school's population is 73% Hispanic and 25% Black. This year, many new teachers joined the school's staff.

A Community Based Organization has opened an office inside the high school and currently has 123 active cases. Their target is to serve 125 at risk students. The staff includes a supervisor, outreach workers, a social worker, and a job-developer/vocational counselor. Among the services provided by the agency are: advocacy; crisis and ongoing counseling; negotiation of bureaucracies; family counseling and outreach; and referrals to other agencies. The agency even makes wake up calls to students every morning. By December, the agency had also made 130 home visits.

Referrals to the CBO are made through a school-based committee that reviews cases referred to them by any personnel in the school. By March, the student referral committee had referred about 200 cases to specified people or programs in the school.

Much of the school's DPP money for systemic improvement is used for student stipends in an employment program devised and implemented by the dropout coordinator and the school planning team. By March, over 100 students were working at various sites. Four major employers include the New York City Department of Housing Preservation and Development, two hospitals, and a Senior Citizens Council. A teacher from the DPP team does job development and contacts the major sites by phone each day to check on the students' attendance and work performance. All jobs are carefully evaluated for their learning potential and value for the students; none of them are dead end jobs.

The program includes block programming of students in academic subjects. It has also provided special trips for all its participants to places of interest in New York in order to create an "esprit de corps" and to familiarize students with their city.

The team has also set up a tutoring and mentoring program. One component of this is academic mentoring. Two teachers, both bilingual, teach in this multi-disciplinary program. While working with students who need special academic help, the teacher-mentors consult each student's subject teachers to develop an Individual Educational Program (IEP). All academic departments have provided appropriate materials to be used as curriculum. A file is maintained for each student and a data base has been established to measure progress.

Another tutoring program has been set up specifically for returning long term absentees. The program, which started this spring, has two teachers who meet on an individual basis with students referred by teachers, guidance counselors, and the attendance office. Thirty-seven students were referred in the first six weeks of the term and more are being brought into the program. It is designed to help these students make the transition back into regular classes after being away from school a long time.

New York University has begun a new collaboration with the school in which 14 graduate students from NYU work with 48 students. This collaboration emphasizes the needs of Haitian students who speak Creole. The NYU students have become mentors and tutors to the youngsters and have stayed on parents' evenings to be available for questions.

Special projects include a joint effort with City Planning to involve local businesses in curriculum and job development. A curriculum developed by HPD, House Sense, is already in place in 9th and 10th grade classes. Another collaborative project with HPD involves students in planting a garden in a vacant lot near the school.

The school has set up a biographical data base for the students in the program. Other students, listed as needing assistance, will be keyed in by staff from the program. Additional items will be added to the biographical list as well as a list of services for these students. The data base was designed by teachers, and allows them to monitor student progress and to produce mailings. In addition, every office dealing with at risk students will keep records of their contacts (phone, mail, individual) and reports on a weekly form; these data are also fed into the system.

d. Special Education AIDP Program

The Division of Special Education AIDP Program provides attendance services to approximately 2,800 targeted "at risk" students. The Office of Alternative Service Programs has established AIDP teams in all regions and in Citywide Programs in Manhattan to serve 36 Intermediate and Junior High School sites.

The DSE model is an itinerant team composed of at least 1 teacher trainer, 1 guidance counselor, or social worker, 4 family workers and 2 office aides who provide counseling, instructional support and intervention, and family outreach to targeted students and families through the six components identified in Circular 29 R. The targeted population is predominantly students in MIS I and MIS II; these programs exhibit the lowest percent of attendance at the Junior High level of any special education program.

e. CBO High School Program

Project S.M.A.R.T. (School Mediator's Alternative Resolution Team) attempts to settle school disputes before suspension is needed. There are four components: 1) classroom seminars designed to generate school-wide interest in mediation and to recruit mediators and cases; 2) training of students, parents, and faculty interested in becoming mediators; 3) mediation of intra-student, intra-family, and student-teacher conflicts by those who completed the training; and 4) follow-up on all mediated cases to discuss ongoing problems. Staff at each school include a full-time coordinator and 2 or 3 trainer consultants as needed. The agency's Directors of School Mediation Services and of mediation Services also spend time as needed working with the program. An administrative assistant and fiscal officer are shared by the three sites.

A unique aspect of this program is that it trains "at risk" students as mediators. These students, with their own academic, attendance, and/or discipline problems, learn the skills of helping others resolve disputes. Thus, the schools' capacity to respond to conflict is increased, while these potential dropouts enhance their ability to resolve problems in their own lives.

A P P E N D I X

AIDP AND DPP HIGH SCHOOLS

LISTING OF HIGH SCHOOLS SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE IN AI/DP AND DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAMS

MANHATTAN		
480	Julia Richman	AI/DP
490	Martin Luther King, Jr.	AI/DP
465	George Washington	AI/DP
535	Park West	AI/DP
460	Washington Irving	AI/DP
445	Seward Park	AI/DP
470	Brandeis	Dropout Prevention
515	Lower East Side	AI/DP
BRONX		
425	Evander Childs	AI/DP
420	James Monroe	AI/DP
400	Morris	AI/DP
475	John F. Kennedy	AI/DP
440	Dewitt Clinton	AI/DP
450	Adlai Stevenson	AI/DP
415	Christopher Columbus	AI/DP
430	Walton	AI/DP
435	Theodore Roosevelt	Dropout Prevention
470	South Bronx	Dropout Prevention
410	Taft	Dropout Prevention
480	Bronx Regional	AI/DP
BROOKLYN		
400	Lafayette	AI/DP
455	Boys & Girls	AI/DP
655	Sara J. Hale	AI/DP
465	Erasmus Hall	AI/DP
470	George Wingate	AI/DP
650	Eli Whitney	AI/DP
480	Bushwick	Dropout Prevention
460	John Jay	Dropout Prevention
435	Thomas Jefferson	Dropout Prevention
440	Prospect Heights	Dropout Prevention
475	Eastern District	Dropout Prevention
QUEENS		
490	Andrew Jackson	AI/DP
445	William C. Bryant	AI/DP
465	Far Rockaway	Dropout Prevention
3-420	Franklin K. Lane	AI/DP
STATEN ISLAND		
450	Curtis	AI/DP

AIDP AND DPP MIDDLE SCHOOLS
LISTED WITH THEIR "LINKED" HIGH SCHOOLS

Attachment 2

By Community School District

C.S. District	Middle School	Designation	High School
1	22	AI/DP	Seward Park
	60	AI/DP	Seward Park
2	70	AI/DP	Park West
3	88	AI/DP	Park West
	44	DPP-CBO	Brandeis
	54	DPP-CBO	Brandeis
	118	DPP-CBO	Brandeis
4	13	AI/DP	Richman
	45	AI/DP	Richman
	99	AI/DP	Richman
	117	AI/DP	Richman
5	10	AI/DP	Washington Irv.
	43	AI/DP	Washington Irv.
6	52	AI/DP	Washington
	143	AI/DP	Washington
	164	AI/DP	Washington
7	151	AI/DP	South Bronx
	139	DPP-PC	South Bronx
	162	DPP-PC	South Bronx
	183	DPP-PC	South Bronx
8	123	AI/DP	Stevenson
	125	AI/DP	Stevenson
	131	AI/DP	Stevenson
	174	AI/DP	Stevenson
	192	AI/DP	Stevenson
	52	AI/DP	Morris
9	82	AI/DP	Clinton
	145	AI/DP	Taft
	148	AI/DP	Taft
	166	AI/DP	Clinton
	22	DPP-CBO	Taft
	117	DPP-CBO	Taft
	147	DPP-CBO	Taft
10	80	AI/DP	Kennedy
	115	AI/DP	Walton
	141	AI/DP	Kennedy
	143	AI/DP	Kennedy
	45	DPP-PC	Roosevelt
	118	DPP-PC	Roosevelt
	137	DPP-PC	Roosevelt

By Community School District

C.S. District	Middle School	Designation	High School
11	113	AI/DP	Childs
	127	AI/DP	Columbus
	135	AI/DP	Columbus
	144	AI/DP	Childs
12	116	AI/DP	Monroe
	167	AI/DP	Monroe
	193	AI/DP	Clinton
	98	AI/DP	Monroe
13	258	AI/DP	Boys & Girls
	265	AI/DP	Hale
	113 (294)	AI/DP	Hale
14	33	AI/DP	Whitney
	126	AI/DP	Whitney
	49	DPP-PC	Eastern Distr
	50	DPP-PC	Eastern Distr
	318	DPP-PC	Eastern Distr
15	293	AI/DP	Hale
	136	AI/DP	Jay
	88	DPP-CBO	Jay
	51	DPP-CBO	Jay
	142	DPP-CBO	Jay
16	35	AI/DP	Boys & Girls
	57	AI/DP	Boys & Girls
	324	AI/DP	Boys & Girls
17	246	AI/DP	Erasmus
	391	AI/DP	Wingate
	61	DPP-PC	Prospect
	320	DPP-PC	Prospect
	390	DPP-PC	Prospect
19	171	AI/DP	Lane
	218	AI/DP	Lane
	166	DPP-CBO	Jefferson
	292	DPP-CBO	Jefferson
	302	DPP-CBO	Jefferson
20	62	AI/DP	Erasmus
21	228	AI/DP	Lafayette
	281	AI/DP	Lafayette

By Community School District

C.S. District	Middle School	Designation	High School
23	55	AI/DP	Boys & Girls
	263	AI/DP	Wingate
	271	AI/DP	Boys & Girls
	275	AI/DP	Boys & Girls
24	93	AI/DP	Lane
27	202	AI/DP	Lane
	210	AI/DP	Lane
	53	DPP-CBO	Far Rockaway
	198	DPP-CBO	Far Rockaway
28	8	AI/DP	Jackson
29	238	AI/DP	Jackson
30	10	AI/DP	Bryant
	126	AI/DP	Bryant
	141	AI/DP	Bryant
31	27	AI/DP	Curtis
	49	AI/DP	Curtis
32	162	AI/DP	Bushwick
	111	DPP-PC	Bushwick
	291	DPP-PC	Bushwick
	296	DPP-PC	Bushwick

Attachment 3

COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING SERVICES TO AIDP AND DPP

HIGH SCHOOL CBOs: 1985-86

Manhattan:	
Brandeis	Cathedral of St. John/Manhattan Valley (DPP) Green Chimneys/Project Continue (DPP)
Seward Park	FEGS (AI/DP)
Bronx:	
Dewitt Clinton	FEGS (Operation Success)(AI/DP)
Morris	Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies (AI/DP)
South Bronx	FEGS (Operation Success)(DPP)
Taft	Banana Kelly (DPP)* NW Bronx Coalition (DPP) Victim Services/Traveler's Aid (DPP)
Theodore Roosevelt	Pius XII/N Bronx Family Services (DPP)
Queens:	
Andrew Jackson	NY Urban League (AI/DP)
Far Rockaway	FEGS (Operation Success)(DPP)
Brooklyn:	
Bushwick	Grand Street Settlement House (DPP)
Erasmus Hall	FEGS (Operation Success)(AI/DP)
Prospect Heights	FEGS (Operation Success)(DPP) Victim Services/Traveler's Aid (DPP)
Thomas Jefferson	FEGS (Operation Success)(DPP)
BASIS:	
Eastern District	Aspira (DPP) FEGS (DPP) Urban Adventures (DPP) Victims Services/Traveler's Aid (DPP)
John Jay	Good Shepherd Services (DPP) Out There Productions (DPP) PACT (DPP)
Lafayette	FEGS (Operation Success)(AI/DP)

* Not Implemented

MIDDLE SCHOOL CBOs: 1985-86

Manhattan:
District 3 - Rheedlen

Bronx:
District 9 - Touro College

Brooklyn:
District 15 - Good Shepherd
District 19 - Colony/South Brooklyn Houses

Queens:
District 27 - FEGS

These CBOs provide services to each DPP middle school in these districts.

Attachment 4

DROPOUT PREVENTION PROGRAMS IN THE MIDDLE SCHOOLS

IMPLEMENTATION AS OF JANUARY 31, 1986

	Number of Schools			
	AIDP		DPP	
COMPONENT/SERVICE	Planned	Implemented	Planned	Implemented
FACILITATION				
Facilitator	68	68	29	27
Pupil Personnel Committee	68	62	29	24
ATTENDANCE				
Outreach	68	60	29	24
Incentives	68	51	29	15
GUIDANCE				
Counseling	68	56	29	25
Mentors	45	32	15	10
Parent Workshops	68	37	29	7
HEALTH SERVICES	68	57	29	20
ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS				
Extended Day	46	31	22	12
Career Education	58	55	21	16
In-School Lab	4	4	0	0
LINKAGES*				
Orientation	62	26	26	5
Joint Activities	36	9	22	2

* Additional linkage activities were planned for the spring term.

ATTENDANCE OF AIDP PARTICIPANTS AS REPORTED TO STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT BY COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

District	School	Attendance 1984-85	Attendance Fall 1985	Increase?
1	22	74%	81%	yes
	60	71%	82.6%	yes
2	70	82%	86%	yes
3	88	72%	75%	yes
	44 DPP	73%	78%	yes
	54 DPP	73%	75%	yes
	118 DPP	72%	74%	yes
4	13	85%	86%	yes
	45	63.8%	77.2%	yes
	99	70%	83.5%	yes
	117	78%	81.8%	yes
5	10	79.7%	75.7%	no
	43	83.4%	85.0%	yes
6	52	84%	88%	yes
	143	79%	87%	yes
	164	74%	82%	yes
7	139 DPP	75%	82%	yes
	151	76.8%	83.4%	yes
	162 DPP	67%	75%	yes
	183 DPP	71%	75%	yes
8	52	80.2%	84%	yes
	123	76%	76.7%	yes
	125	83%	87%	yes
	131	82.1%	88.5%	yes
	174	83%	86.7%	yes
	192	86%	92%	yes
9	82	82.4%	84.7%	yes
	145	80%	90%	yes
	166	55.4%	68.5%	yes
	148	78.6%	80.9%	yes
10	45 DPP	73%	79%	yes
	80	72.9%	77.5%	yes
	118 DPP	74%	83%	yes
	115	82%	87%	yes
	137 DPP	81%	84%	yes
	141	76%	89%	yes
	143	75%	79%	yes

District	School	Attendance 1984-85	Attendance Fall 1985	Increase?
11	113	80%	85%	yes
	127	77.1%	80.6%	yes
	135	82%	82%	no
	144	85.2%	82.7%	no
12	116	76.5%	74%	no
	167	68.7%	71.95%	yes
	193	84.5%	81.7%	no
	98	77.5%	70.2%	no
13	113	73%	81%	yes
	258	68.6%	71.2%	yes
	265	Not available		
14	33	73.4%	77.2%	yes
	126	77.6%	75.5%	no
	49 DPP	78.4%	80.5%	yes
	50 DPP	79.4%	79.6%	yes
	318 DPP	81.5%	81.5%	no
15	136	Not available		
	293			
16	35	Not available		
	57			
	324			
17	246	85.75%	82%	no
	391	86.5%	82%	no
	61 DPP	84.8%	67.3%	no
	320 DPP	83.0%	80%	no
	390 DPP	78.63%	60.82%	no
19	171, 218	76.8%	80%	yes
20	62	78%	83%	yes
21	281	66%	79%	yes
	228	79%	87%	yes
23	55	74%	84%	yes
	271	77%	78%	yes
	263	61%	84%	yes
	275	78%	78%	no
32	162	Not available		

District	School	Attendance 1984-85	Attendance Fall 1985	Increase?
24	93	73%	87%	yes
27	198 DPP	77%	81%	yes
	202	76%	70%	no
	210	75%	81%	yes
28	8	64.35%	68.77%	yes
29	238	79%	82%	yes
30	10	75%	85%	yes
	126	77%	83%	yes
	141	60%	73%	yes
31	27	82.08%	82.94%	yes
	49	70.51%	68%	no

NOTE:
Some Community School Districts included data on DPP schools in their reports to the State; others did not.